

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-18 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 10-17 are amended.

Claim Objections

The Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) objects to claims 10-17 because of informalities. Applicants amend claims 10-17, as suggested by the Examiner to obviate the objection thereto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 10-17 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 10-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10-13 and 16-17 are amended variously to provide antecedent basis for the terms: “the management,” “the current state,” “the user,” “the basis,” “the events,” “the interactions,” “the list,” “the values,” “the result,” “the action,” “the form,” “the activity,” “the specifications,” and “the man-machine interface services.” Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §101

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, independent claim 10 is amended and amended and unamended claims are believed to be directed to statutory subject matter for the reasons discussed below.

The instant invention relates to a man-machine interface working with a task model executed on a computer, (see specification, page 4, line 12, disclosing a computer interface; page 11, last paragraph, disclosing a model in XML language; page 10, line 15, disclosing a microcomputer may be used in combination with the computer; and page 7, lines 29-30, disclosing wherein the man-machine interface may be either a vocal system, or a screen or even a PDA.

In re Bilski (545 F.3d 943, 88 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (CAFC 2008)), the Federal Circuit indicated that the new test of patentability is whether the claimed method is: (1) tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transforms a particular article to a different state or thing. Applicants respectfully submit that as amended, the claims meet at least the first test of patentability, reciting wherein the method is tied to “an existing task model stored on a computer.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed subject matter is patentable under 35 USC §101. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 10-18 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (US 2004/0031058) is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are distinguished from Reisman in that the claims recite a method of enhancing of an interface, whereas Reisman relates to the interface itself, i.e., using a plurality of coordinated input/output device sets or alternative link bases (*see e.g. abstract of Reisman*).

Fig. 3 of Reisman discloses wherein items 324 and 334 are “interactive content.” Item 334 is in fact part of a “much richer ITV screen,” (Reisman, first line paragraph [0122]), and this is what the Examiner appears to assume to be an “enhanced task model.” However, this content (e.g. a Web page, as said in 8th line of [0122]) is not a task model, but merely the displayed result of a task (the task of a web navigator in that instance), and it nowhere suggestive of either a model or current state of a user. Reisman appears to only enhance the quality of the display.

In addition, paragraph [0002] of Reisman appears to only disclose wherein the field of the invention relates to the use of multiple coordinated device sets, and nowhere suggest a task model.

Regarding paragraph [0053] Reisman discloses “task sessions,” which Applicants submit are only “browser sessions” or similar application sessions (*see* [0050]).

The Examiner further relies on paragraph [0055], however, this paragraph refers to a

rather obvious definition of a “software process state,” but fails to disclose what can be done with this state. Regardless of the above distinction, the “state,” as recited in claim 10, refers to the user current state and not to a software process state.

Furthermore, paragraph [0065] refers to a rather obvious definition of a user interface, mentioning a “user’s mental model of the interaction” and an “internal model” of the virtual world. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these models are not task models, as recited in claim 10.

Still further, elements 540, 550 of Reisman’s Fig. 5 appear to relate to a migration from a system (A) to a system (B) (*see* paragraph [0133]). However, it should be kept in mind that the purpose of such a migration is the ability to use either one of a plurality of input/output device sets, i.e. “systems” (*see* e.g., paragraphs [0009] and [0010]), suggesting that the object of this reference is not to forecast some future evolution of the man-machine interfaces, but merely to switch from one interface to another interface among a limited number of known interfaces (PC and TV-related interfaces), and does not suggest modifying these interfaces, once the system is built, taking a “snapshot” of a user’s current state or to enhance a current state.

A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently.

Accordingly, because Reisman does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 10, Applicants’ recited method is distinguished over Reisman and therefore the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claim 10 is patentable over Reisman.

Claims 11-18 depend from independent claim 10 and are likewise patentable over Reisman at least for their dependence on claim 10, an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection over Reisman is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 31, 2009
KMB/ERM/ser